

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 09/296,835 | 04/22/1999 | RONALD A. WEIMER | M4065.0319/P319 | M4065.0319/P319 8895 | |
| 24998 | 7590 05/15/2003 | | | j | |
| DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP | | | EXAMINER | | |
| 2101 L STRI WASHINGT | EET NW ON, DC 20037-1526 | | KIELIN, ERIK J | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2813 DATE MAILED: 05/15/2003 | 36 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| * Advisory Action | 09/296, 835 | WEIMER ET AL. | | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Erik Kielin | 2813 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence addr | ess | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applice it is applicated and the same it | cation. A proper rep ch places the applic | oly to a ation in | | | | |
| <u>PERIOD FOR RE</u> | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE con which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. So I 36(a) and the appropriate the fee. The appropriate extention; or (| ee MPEP extension fee ension fee under (2) as set forth in | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | | |
| (a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (b) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mat | erially reducing or si | implifying the | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | • | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: | r reconsideration has been cons | sidered but does NO | T place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which wer | e newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | • • • — | • | and an | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| 8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp | proved by the Exam | iner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · | | | | | |
| O. ☐ Other: PATENT EXAMINER | | | | | | | |
| | | Carellada | ٦ | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 09/296,835





Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: That the pressure in the RTA chamber is less than atmospheric, that the oxygen-deficient film is crystalline are new issues. That the oxygen-deficient film is non-crystalline is new matter --only "amorphous" is supported by the specification. The use of the terminology "single wet oxidation" is unsupported by the specification. It is also noted that Applicant is introducing additional species that will be subject to restriction.